| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary   | Application No. | Applicant(s)                   |
|--|-----------------|--------------------------------|
|  | 10/764,774      | DE VROOME, CLEMENS<br>JOHANNES |
|  | Examiner        | Art Unit                       |
|  | Laura Edwards   | 1734                           |
| All Participants: Status of Application: <u>Pending</u>  |                 |                                |
| (1) <u>Laura Edwards</u> .   | (3)             |                                |
| (2) William Gehris.  | (4)             |                                |
| Date of Interview: 7 November 2005   | Time: <u>AM</u> |                                |
| Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:   |                 |                                |
| Part I.  |                 |                                |
| Rejection(s) discussed: Possible 103 Rejection   |                 |                                |
| Claims discussed: All in general   |                 |                                |
| Prior art documents discussed:  Newly found reference (Menet et al (USPAP 2002/0106444)  |                 |                                |
| Part II.   |                 |                                |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  See Continuation Sheet  |                 |                                |
| Part III.  |                 |                                |
| <ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul> |                 |                                |
| ,  |                 |                                |
|  |                 |                                |
|  |                 |                                |
|  |                 |                                |
|  |                 |                                |
| ·  |                 |                                |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)   |                 |                                |

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-413B)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On Monday, Nov. 7th, Mr. Gehris was notified of the Menet et al reference and the Examiner requested an Exr. Amendment to claim 1, line 8, to --applicator disposed in at least one container-- or the alternative, --applicator in at least one container-- to place the application in better condition for allowance. Mr. Gehris noted that consultation with Applicants would be required. On Thursday, Nov. 10th, Mr. Gehris was called again, however, without resolve. On the afternoon of Thursday, Nov. 10th, Mr. Gehris telephoned the Examiner and requested a written rejection.